



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,804	01/08/2004	Montgomery C. McGraw	200600385-1	1592
22879 7590 12/19/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2835				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/754,804

Applicant(s)

MCGRAW ET AL.

Examiner

ANTHONY Q. EDWARDS

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 12-19, 24, 25, 26-36, 40-48, 53-62, 66 and 67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,384,368 to Rosenfeldt et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,557 to Martinez et al. Referring to claims 1, 15, 26 and 59, Rosenfeldt discloses a system for displaying chassis component information, comprising a chassis (1), a plurality of blades (15-18) each coupled to the chassis, each blade comprising a display (25) positioned upon the blade, the respective display operable to display chassis component information. See Figs. 1, 5 and 8 and the corresponding specification. Rosenfeldt does not specifically teach the display (25) of each blade being an LCD display, and the blades (15-18) being server blades for a server system.

Martinez discloses a state/activity indication system using icons on an LCD (see electronic chassis (see Figs. 1 and 3B) comprising an LCD display (124) utilized in a variety of computer systems, wherein the computer systems include a headless server system (see col. 2, lines 17-23). Such headless server systems include the well known

bladed server arrangement. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to apply the technique of utilizing LCD displays, as taught by Martinez, on blade server devices, to improve the system of Rosenfeldt for the predictable result of updating the system with blade servers having an easy to read LCD display on each blade servers in the computer system. See *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976) and *Leapfrog Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, --F3d--, 82USPQ2d 1687 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

Referring to claims 2 and 17, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis component information comprises server blade information of the server blade upon which the respective LCD is positioned. See col. 3, lines 3-8 of Rosenfeldt.

Referring to claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19, 27, 60 and 61, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez inherently disclose the device as claimed, since an IP (i.e., internet protocol) address, which acts as a locator for one IP device to find another IP device and interact with the same, is provided in any network system. Likewise, monitoring chassis component activity (e.g., processor speed) is also disclosed. See lines "Background" of Rosenfeldt.

Referring to claim 5, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD being operable to display the information in color. It is well known in the art of LCD devices to utilize a variety of colors, thus it would have been obvious to further modify Rosenfeldt to include colors in the display, since this would help to distinguish one error or status message from another.

Referring to claims 7 and 62, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis component information comprises at least one of temperature information and voltage information. See col. 7, lines 25-35 of Martinez.

Referring to claims 12, 17, 24 and 66, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective management processor (130) operable to drive the respective LCD, the management processor being operationally distinct from a main processor of the server blade such that the main processor may be inactive during operation of the respective LCD. See Fig. 1 of Martinez.

Referring to claim 13, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective video output operable to output the chassis component information to an external display (not shown) and a respective management processor (130) operable to drive the respective video output, the respective management processor operationally distinct from a respective main processor of the server blade such that the respective main processor may be inactive during output of the chassis component information to the external display. See col. 3, lines 1-6 of Martinez.

Referring to claims 14 and 67, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD specifically comprising a viewing area of 14mm x 11 mm. It would have been obvious, however, to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a relatively small display with the dimensions as claimed on the bulkhead of Rosenfeldt. See Fig. 2 of Rosenfeldt.

Referring to claim 25, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis blade inherently comprises a network interface card. See col. 2, lines 42-50.

Referring to claims 28 and 29, Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein the display device comprises at least one LED (28) and an LCD (25), respectively. See Fig. 1 of Rosenfeldt.

Regarding claims 30-36, 40-49 and 53-62, the method steps are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez.

Claims 8-11, 20-23, 37-39, 50-52, 63-65 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0084994 to Hansen. Rosenfeldt, as modified, discloses the system and corresponding method as claimed, including at least one server blade of inherently including chassis management operable to manage switch fabric of the chassis. See Figs. 1 and 7 of Martinez. Rosenfeldt, as modified, does not teach each server blade further comprising at least one control key associated with the LCD to enable operation control of at least one chassis component.

Hansen teaches a front panel serial port user interface (28) in the form of an LCD with control keys (40) to control setup and power on an individual server blade (10). See Figs. 1-3 and paragraph 0021. It would have been obvious to further modify the system and method of Rosenfeldt to include control key(s) for operational control of at least one chassis component on the server blade, as taught by Hansen, since the

device of Hansen would allow for specific control functions on each server blade individually.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding applicants arguments on page 13 of the Remarks that Rosenfeldt in view of Martinez does not teach server blades, as stated in the rejection above, although Rosenfeldt does not specifically disclose "server" blades, the inserts or blades (15-18) of Rosenfeldt function in conjunction with the chassis (1) in the same manner as a blade, i.e., a user slides the insert into the chassis and (2) the inserts are provided in the stacked relationship in the chassis.

Likewise, Martinez discloses a state/activity indication system using icons on an LCD (see electronic chassis (see Figs. 1 and 3B) comprising an LCD display (124) utilized in a variety of computer systems, wherein the computer systems include a headless server system (see col. 2, lines 17-23). Such headless server systems include the well known bladed server arrangement. As indicated previously, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to apply the technique of utilizing LCD displays, as taught by Martinez, on blade server devices, to improve the system of Rosenfeldt for the predictable result of updating the system with blade servers having an easy to read LCD display on each blade servers in the computer system. See *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976) and *Leapfrog Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, --F3d--, 82USPQ2d 1687 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Therefore, the Examiner is not in agreement with Applicant's statement that "the differences between the claims

and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.” In the Examiner’s view, the pending claims are a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In response to applicant’s argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Rosenfeldt teaches a computer system with inserts, the inserts having display, but lacks the teaching of the display being an LCD display.

In response to applicant’s argument that the examiner’s conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant’s disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant’s argument that Rosenfeldt and Martinez is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of

applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the computer system of Rosenfeldt having inserts with a display on each insert and the teaching a specific kind of display (i.e., LCD) for an insert or blade is disclosed in the combination.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **ANTHONY Q. EDWARDS** whose telephone number is (571)272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2835

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. Q. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2835

December 16, 2008

/Jayprakash N Gandhi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2835